arXiv:gr-qc/9403009v1 2 Mar 1994

THE ISOLATION OF GRAVITATIONAL INSTANTONS: FLAT TORI vs. FLAT R^4

Jemal Guven

Instituto de Ciencias Nucleares

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México

A. Postal 70-543. 04510 México, D. F., MEXICO

(guven@roxanne.nuclecu.unam.mx)

Abstract

The role of topology in the perturbative solution of the Euclidean Einstein equations (EEEs) about flat instantons is examined. When the topology is open (with asymptotically flat boundary conditions) it is simple to demonstrate that all vacuum perturbations vanish at all orders in perturbation theory; when the topology is closed (a four-torus say) all but a 10-parameter family of global metric deformations (moving us from one flat torus to another) vanish. Flat solutions, regardless of their topology, are perturbatively isolated as solutions of the EEEs. The perturbation theory of the complete Einstein equations contrasts dramatically with that of the trace of these equations, the vanishing of the scalar curvature. In the latter case, the flat tori are isolated whereas R^4 is not. This is a consequence of a linearization instability of the trace equation which is not a linearization instability of the complete EEEs.

I. Introduction

When the spatial topology is closed the solution of the (Lorentzian) Einstein equations (LEEs) is always complicated by the requirement that the solution be consistent with various integrability conditions associated with the closure of the topology.

An unexpected uniquely perturbative manifestation of these integrability conditions was discovered twenty one years ago in a pioneering paper by Brill and Deser[1,2,3]: when the LEEs are perturbed about any spatially closed solution which admits a killing vector integrability conditions appear at second order in perturbation theory which restrict the function space of the linear perturbations — the equations suffer from a linearization instability. The important point is that these constraints cannot be derived by examining the linearized equations alone. Thus, not only is the validity of the linearized theory undermined but the implementation of perturbation theory becomes seriously complicated. Indeed, the consequences of the linearization instability of the Einstein equations extend beyond perturbation theory. For they imply the impossibility, even in principle, of identifying the physical phase space of general relativity when the topology is closed [4].

The linearization instability of the LEEs (the subject of Ref.[2]) implies that a flat three-torus T^3 (corresponding to the spacetime topology $T^3 \times R$) does not admit any maximal first order metric perturbations that are not also flat. This means that there are no nearby solutions of the Einstein equations possessing a maximal surface that are not also flat — the flat tori are isolated with respect to such perturbations. There is no analogous obstruction to the existence of such spacetimes when space is open and the asymptotically flat boundary conditions which are then appropriate are imposed. The closed spatial topology in this case severely limits the possible nearby solutions of the LEEs.

Intuitively, one might expect the analogs of the integrability conditions exhibited in the Lorenzian theory to be even stronger in the Euclidean theory and all the more so when

the four-topology is closed. This is because the Euclidean Einstein equations (EEEs) we are now solving are elliptic, not hyperbolic, and we would expect additional integrability conditions to be associated with the sewing up of the topology in the timelike direction. Indeed, the solution space of the vacuum EEEs with a fixed closed topology is typically found to be finite dimensional[5].

This intuition is not, however, as sound as it might appear because there are also preciously few asymptotic flat solutions with simple topology. To begin with, the unique solution with R^4 topology is flat R^4[6]. Any other asymptotically flat instanton must be topologically non trivial. Neither is there any not-flat solution with topology $R^3 \times S^1$[7,8]. In both cases, the key component underpinning the proof is the positivity of the ADM mass. There are also good reasons to believe that the only solutions with topology $R^2 \times S^2$ are the one-parameter family of Schwarzschild instantons corresponding to a positive ADM mass. We must conclude that the finite dimensionality of the solution space of the EEEs is not a unique feature of closed topologies. Asymptotic flatness can be an even more restrictive boundary condition than closure on solutions of the EEEs.

In this paper we examine the EEEs perturbatively with a view to identifying the source of this apparent disregard for topology. We begin in sec.II by contrasting perturbation theory about two flat solutions of these equations, flat R^4 with asymptotically flat boundary conditions — open in all directions, and a flat four-torus T^4 which is completely closed.

The only allowed perturbations of flat T^4 are perturbations moving us about the ten parameter family of globally inequivalent flat T^4s[9]. In fact, we can show that modulo these, perturbations vanish to all orders in perturbation theory. There do not appear, however, to be any obstructions on T^4 limiting the solution of the full EEEs to one of these flat solutions. Such solutions are strictly perturbatively isolated from the given flat solution. This contrasts with the open topology where the flat solution is unique.

The four-tori are the Euclidean analogs of the flat spacetimes with topology $T^3 \times R$ in

the Lorenzian theory. One might therefore have expected some analog of Brill and Deser's linearization instability to show up. However, linearization instability plays no role in establishing the isolation of flat tori. No (non-trivial) first order pertubations survive the integrability conditions operating at that order in the Euclidean theory. If we had, however, failed to recognize these conditions at first order, the integrability conditions appearing at second order would have mopped up the spurious solutions resulting from our oversight.

To provide a heuristic argument why one would expect linearization instability to play a diminished role in the Euclidean Einstein theory, in sec.III we examine briefly what happens to the linearization instability of the Lorenzian theory studied by Brill and Deser when the signature of the spacetime metric is made Euclidean. What occurs is that the quadratic form in first order quantities which appears at second order in perturbation theory is no longer positive definite. The result is that the associated integrability condition is a much weaker one.

In sec.IV we examine a subset of the vacuum EEEs, the vanishing of their trace (the scalar curvature). Now, every solution of the full theory is clearly also a solution of this truncated theory but not conversely. However, unlike the full EEEs, this single equation does suffer from a linearization instability which kills all non flat TT perturbations of any flat T^4. One *does* have to proceed to second order in perturbation to see this. The analogs of these perturbations satisfying asymptotically flat boundary conditions not only survive on R^4 but are freely specifiable. The essential difference between the EEEs and the trace equation in this context is that solutions of the latter equation do not necessarily satisfy the positive mass (action) theorem which is a property of the full Einstein equations and not of any proper subset thereof.

This result has a simple application. If linearization instability kills a perturbation in the truncated theory it clearly also kills it in the full theory whether or not the full theory itself suffers from a linearization instability. We exploit this reasoning to prove the perturbative isolation of the EEEs coupled to matter with a trace negative stress tensor.

II. Euclidean Einstein Equations: R^4 vs. T^4

Let us begin by examining the ingredients contributing to the perturbative isolation of flat instantons in greater detail. We decompose the metric about the flat background

$$g_{ab} = \delta_{ab} + \epsilon h_{ab} + \epsilon^2 j_{ab} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^3)\,. \tag{1}$$

The symmetric tensor h_{ab} ($j_{ab}, \cdots$) can be decomposed as follows

$$\begin{aligned} h_{ab} =& h^t_{ab} + \partial_a h^L_b + \partial_b h^L_a \\ =& h^{TT}_{ab} + \frac{1}{3}(\delta_{ab}\Delta - \partial_a\partial_b)h^T + \frac{1}{4}\delta_{ab}C_h + \partial_a h^L_b + \partial_b h^L_a\,, \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where $\Delta \equiv \partial^a\partial_a$. The first line represents the decomposition into a transverse component h^t_{ab} and a longitudinal component characterized by a vector, h^L_a. The divergence of h_{ab} determines h^L_a up to an irrelevant killing vector of the background geometry. On the second line, the transverse component is itself decomposed into a transverse traceless component, h^{TT}_{ab} and a remainder characterized by the scalar h^T and the constant C_h, which is transverse by construction. The constant mode (which only appears when the topology is closed) is the spatial average of $h^{ta}{}_a$,

$$C_h = \frac{1}{V}\int dV\, h^{t\,a}{}_a\,. \tag{3}$$

At first order the Ricci tensor is given by

$$R^{(1)}_{ab} = \frac{1}{2}\left(-\partial_a\partial_b h - \Delta h_{ab} + \partial^c\partial_b h_{ca} + \partial^c\partial_a h_{cb}\right)\,. \tag{4}$$

The linearized trace equation

$$R^{(1)} = -\Delta h + \partial^a\partial^b h_{ab} = 0 \tag{5}$$

is identically satisfied by h^{TT}_{ab}, h^{L}_{a} and C_h. It reduces therefore to an equation determining h^T:

$$\Delta^2 h^T = 0\,. \tag{6}$$

The only solution of Eq.(6) consistent with the open topology is $h^T = 0$; with the closed topology, h^T = constant. This constant can, however, safely be dropped as it does not contribute to h_{ab}. It is a special feature of perturbations about flat space that the equation $R^{(1)} = 0$ can be solved without reference to any gauge conditions. More generally, the equation will not be tractable until gauge conditions freezing the diffeomorphism invariance of the theory are specified and the resulting equations solved simultaneously. The appropriate variables to gauge fix are h^{L}_{a}. We choose the four gauge conditions

$$h^{L}_{a} = 0\,. \tag{7}$$

In perturbation theory, it is obvious that the 'natural' gauge choice is just the gauge, (7).

After gauge fixing, we are left with the unconstrained variables h^{TT}_{ab} and C_h.

The perturbed tracefree vacuum EEEs are now given by

$$\Delta h^{TT}_{ab} = 0\,, \tag{8}$$

which is Laplace's equation for each h^{TT}_{ab}. We should have anticipated that the linearized Euclidean equations would assume the form (8): The Laplace equation is nothing other than the analytic continuation of the wave equation we obtain when we linearize the Lorenzian Einstein equations. The only everywhere regular solution consistent with asymptotically flat boundary conditions $h^{TT}_{ab} \sim \mathcal{O}(r^{-1})$ on R^4 is $h^{TT}_{ab} = 0$; in the case of T^4 the appropriate boundary conditions are periodic conditions on R^4 treated as the universal cover of T^4. The solution is a linear combination of the 9 constant TT-perturbations. With C_h, these make up a ten parameter family of metric perturbations of T^4. The Riemann curvature vanishes on any of these perturbations. These solutions are the perturbative relics

of the ten dimensional space of parameters characterizing the global geometry of flat T^4's. These parameters can be taken to be the lengths of the four homotopically inequivalent closed minimal curves on T^4 and the six angles between them. We therefore can conclude that the only allowed infinitesimal physical (non-diffeomorphism) metrical deformations of T^4 are changes in this parameter space. These deformations survive because the EEEs do not distinguish between globally inequivalent flat spaces with the same topology. We note that

$$C_h = 2\frac{\delta V}{V}\,,$$

when $h^T = 0$ and $h^L_a = 0$ and therefore corresponds to a change of volume. This can be constructed from an appropriate linear combination of the ten parameters.

At second order, note that the contribution to $R^{(2)}_{ab}$ due to h_{ab} is given by [10]

$$\begin{aligned} R^{(2)}_{ab} =& \frac{1}{2}\Big[\frac{1}{2}\partial_a h^{cd}\partial_b h_{cd} + h^{cd}(\partial_a\partial_b h_{cd} + \partial_c\partial_d h_{ab} - \partial_b\partial_d h_{ac} - \partial_a\partial_d h_{bc}) \\ &+ \partial^d h_b{}^c(\partial_d h_{ac} - \partial_c h_{ad}) - (\partial^d h^c{}_d - \frac{1}{2}\partial^c h)(\partial_b h_{ac} + \partial_a h_{bc} - \partial_c h_{ab})\Big]\,. \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

This term acts as a source for the second order perturbation, j_{ab}. However, h_{ab} is zero (constant) so that j_{ab} and all higher orders vanish (are also constants).

III Linearization Instability: LEE's vs. EEEs

The isolation of the flat tori as solution of the the EEEs is not a consequence of a linearization instability in these equations. Indeed, if there is any linearization instability in the EEEs associated with the closure of the topology there are good reasons for believing that it is not as severe as the linearization instability in the corresponding Lorenzian theory. As a justification for this claim consider a Euclidean retreatment of Brill and Deser's perturbative ADM analysis of the three-dimensional flat torus with spacetime topology

$T^3 \times R$. In the corresponding Euclidean problem with the same topology, the change in the spacetime signature manifests itself in a change of sign of the extrinsic curvature quadratic in the Hamiltonian constraint[10]. Eq.(5.4) of Ref.[2] gets replaced by (also see below)

$$\Delta^2 j^T - (\pi^{TT\,ab})^2 + \frac{1}{4}(\vec{\partial} h^{TT}_{ab})^2 + \text{divergence} = 0\,. \tag{10}$$

The linearization instability (if there is one) is realized by integrating this equation over the closed spatial volume. The divergence terms involving both first order and second order quantities now vanish. We get

$$\int dV \left[(\pi^{TT\,ab})^2 - \frac{1}{4}(\vec{\partial} h^{TT}_{ab})^2\right] = 0\,. \tag{11}$$

The Euclidean constraint Eq.(11) is considerably weaker than its Lorenzian counterpart (where the sign of $(\vec{\partial} h^{TT}_{ab})^2$ is reversed). In the latter case the positive definiteness of the quadratic in $\pi^{TT\,ab}$ and h^{TT}_{ab} implied the extremely stringent condition $\pi^{TT\,ab} = 0 = \partial_c h^{TT}_{ab}$ on the first order perturbations.[1]

IV Perturbations of Zero Ricci Curvature vs. Perturbations of Zero Scalar Curvature

The way we solved the perturbative vacuum EEEs was to first solve the non-linear elliptic equation,

$$R = 0\,, \tag{12}$$

[1] We are ignoring the fact here that if we consider the full set of linearized EEEs, both $\pi^{TT\,ab}$ and h^{TT}_{ab} vanish at first order. Therefore Eq.(11) is not a manifestation of a linearization instability.

perturbatively. Flat R^4 admitted non trivial perturbative solutions, any h^{TT}_{ab} consistent with asymptotically flat boundary conditions was a solution (it was the remaining nine tracefree equations which annihilated them as solutions of the EEEs). What is surprising therefore in light of this is that the flat T^4's do not admit non-flat perturbative solutions of Eq.(12). This is a consequence of a genuine linearization instability of the single equation, Eq.(12).

To see this, we note that Eq.(12) on any space with T^4 topology is exactly the super-Hamiltonian constraint in five dimensional general relativity on a momentarily static slice through a spacetime with topology, $T^4 \times R$. This means that the problem has been conveniently reduced to a special case of Brill and Deser's analysis (stepped up one dimension) and we can exploit the techniques used in Refs.[1] and [2]. For completeness, however, and for the purpose of making various observations we will reproduce some of the details.

We note that in two dimensions, the only solutions to Eq.(12) are flat. In all higher dimensions, however, this equation admits non-flat solutions. The existence of non-trivial solutions to this equation assures us that the perturbative isolation we discuss is not merely a rediscovery of a non-perturbative isolation which is rendering the closed flat solution unique in any case.

To examine Eq.(12) perturbatively we expand the metric about the flat background δ_{ab} in the manner of Eq.(1). The game is to identify integrability conditions which appear at each order in perturbation theory which kill perturbations of the preceeding order. For the purpose of simplifying the statement of these perturbative integrability conditions, it is more convenient to consider perturbations of the density, $\sqrt{g}R$. Let us first recall various elementary properties of the density, $\sqrt{g}R$. Corresponding to any first order local variation of the metric, $g_{ab} \to g_{ab} + \delta g_{ab}$

$$\delta\left[\sqrt{g}R\right] = -\sqrt{g}G^{ab}\delta g_{ab} + \sqrt{g}g^{ab}\delta R_{ab}\,. \tag{13}$$

The important point is that the second term is a divergence. This feature will be extremely

useful in that it enables us to isolate divergences in the perturbative expansion of $\sqrt{g}R$. In the absence of boundary surfaces, these divergences will be killed when we integrate over the manifold.

Let us denote the n^{th} order perturbation in $\sqrt{g}R$ by $\left(\sqrt{g}R\right)^{(n)}$. In particular, at the first order in perturbation theory about flat space the first term on the RHS of Eq.(13) vanishes and $\left(\sqrt{g}R\right)^{(1)}$ is the divergence appearing in Eq.(5). As before, the solution to $\left(\sqrt{g}R\right)^{(1)} = 0$ is (without any loss of generality) $h^T = 0$. We fix the gauge as before with Eq.(7) and we are left with the unconstrained variables h^{TT}_{ab} and C_h.

When we proceed to the next order of perturbation theory, an integrability condition will appear which completely kills h^{TT}_{ab} when the space is closed. Let us examine the second order equation $\left(\sqrt{g}R\right)^{(2)} = 0$ a little more carefully to see how this comes about. To simplify the evaluation of $(\sqrt{g}R)^{(2)}$, we express the second order variation in the form

$$\delta^2\left(\sqrt{g}R\right) = -\delta\left(\sqrt{g}G^{ab}\delta g_{ab}\right) + \delta(\sqrt{g}g^{ab}\delta R_{ab})\,. \tag{14}$$

What makes things simple is that the divergence term will remain a divergence under the second variation. Thus $\delta(\sqrt{g}g^{ab}\delta R_{ab})$ is another divergence. Therefore, at second order

$$(\sqrt{g}R)^{(2)} = -\left(h^{ab} - \frac{1}{2}h\delta^{ab}\right)R^{(1)}_{ab} + \text{divergence}\,, \tag{15}$$

where the first order perturbation in the Ricci tensor is given by Eq.(4). We note that, modulo the divergence, the second order perturbation in the density is independent of the second order perturbation in the Ricci tensor, $R^{(2)}_{ab}$.*

We can continue in this way to conclude that $\left(\sqrt{g}R\right)^{(n)}$ involves only the preceeding order perturbation in the Ricci tensor. Consultation of Eq.(9) should be sufficient to appreciate the value of grouping terms this way. We have not explicitly written down the

* This device was exploited in Refs.[1] and [2] although its potential was never emphasized there.

contributions due to the second order perturbations, j_{ab} which appear at second order. It is however a simple matter to incorporate them at this level. The contribution to the density at second order will be the corresponding first order expression with h_{ab} replaced by j_{ab}. Thus the second order contributions due to j_{ab} is the divergence appearing in Eq.(5) with h_{ab} replaced by j_{ab}. This is an important yet scarcely explored feature of perturbative canonical Einstein gravity (in a technical sense, it is the origin of the linearization instability constraint). The second order constraint equation is

$$\Delta^2 j^T + \frac{1}{4}(\vec{\partial} h^{TT}_{ab})^2 + \text{divergence} = 0\,, \tag{16}$$

where the divergence appearing in Eq.(16) involves only quadratics in first order perturbations. Only the j^T component of the second order metric perturbation, j_{ab} appears. Eq.(16) is therefore an equation for j^T with source consisting of terms quadratic in first order quantities. The remaining components of j_{ab} remain undetermined at second order. C_h does not appear in the equation. Because the space is closed, the integral of Eqs.(16) over the spatial volume yields the constraint (linearization instability) on the first order perturbations:

$$\int dV (\vec{\partial} h^{TT}_{ab})^2 = 0\,. \tag{17}$$

The first order transverse traceless perturbations must therefore, as before, be constants. The only perturbations which survive are the perturbations corresponding to the ten parameters discussed above.

The two essential features contributing to the result we have established are that the background space is both closed and flat. There is no corresponding result when space is open and flat. If the background is not flat, j_{ab} will appear in terms other than the divergence. These terms survive the integration over the volume of space, and the equation corresponding to Eq.(17) no longer represents a constraint on the first order perturbations.

At higher orders in perturbation theory the pattern will be repeated with constraints appearing on the higher order perturbations killing all but the ten constant deformations discussed earlier. It is therefore impossible as before to perturb away from a flat solution. This differs from the corresponding result for the full EEEs is that the obstruction here can be attributed to topology.

V. An Application

If a linearization instability kills a perturbation in the truncated theory it clearly also kills it in the full theory whether or not the full theory itself suffers from a linearization instability. This reasoning can be exploited to prove that the flat tori are isolated as solutions of the EEEs coupled to matter with a trace-free stress tensor (in particular, the vacuum theory considered in sec.II)

$$T^a{}_a = 0\,. \tag{18}$$

Such a stress tensor corresponds to a conformally invariant material field. The trick is to note that whenever Eq.(18) holds any solution of

$$G_{ab} = 8\pi T_{ab} \tag{19}$$

also satisfies Eq.(12). It is also clear using an identical argument to that presented in Ref.[1] with the energy density replaced by $T^a{}_a$ that this result also goes through under the weaker condition that $T^a{}_a$ (R) be negative (positive) definite.

We stress that it is incorrect to conclude from this that the flat tori are isolated in this way because of a linearization instability of the complete EEEs. The linearization instability we have exploited is that of the single traced equation. The linearization instability in this subset of the field equations does, however, eliminate the necessity to consider the

remaining equations. The trade off is that one needs to proceed to second order in perturbation theory. Whether this is a peculiarity of perturbation theory about flat solutions or can be exploited in other contexts remains to be seen.

One final comment on the example considered above. Does the addition of the source of matter considered above in any way change our conclusions for the vacuum theory? To test if it does one needs to know how flat R^4 respond to perturbations coupled to a stress tensor of the form considered above. The answer is no. For the non-existence result in the vacuum theory remains valid when the Ricci tensor is positive (in particular, if T_{ab} has a positive trace)[11].

With a generic source of matter, solutions of the asymptotically flat theory will exist. On the closed topology, however, they will be subject to integrability conditions.

VI. Conclusions

In this paper, we have examined the dependence on topology of perturbative solutions of the EEEs about flat instantons. This dependence contrasts dramatically with that of analogous Lorenzian solutions. Closure, in the Euclidean theory is not necessarily a more restrictive condition than asymptotic flatness. In particular, linearization instability does not appear to play the significant role it does in the Lorenzian theory.

The nature of the restrictions associated with the topology appears also to depend crucially on the elliptic system of equations we are solving. In particular, the solution space of the EEEs and that of the trace of these equations have very different dependences on the topology.

It is not clear if physics is sensitive to these topological considerations. In the semi-classical context, solutions of the Euclidean equations of motions appear as saddle points in the functional integral formulation of the quantum theory. The prototype is the decay of the false vacuum calculation in a self-interacting scalar quantum field theory with a true

and a false vacuum[12]. In the semi-classical approximation, the tunneling amplitude from false to true vacuum is dominated by an $O(4)$ invariant bounce. However, there are nearby instantons which are not $O(4)$ invariant [13]. The non-existence of nearby instantons in the Einstein theory might appear to suggest that the semi-classical approximation to quantum gravity represents a poor approximation to the exact theory. However, the non-existence of nearby solutions can only reduce the prefactor of the exponential and therefore cannot affect the conclusions of the approximation. There is another way in which the approximation might fail, however. For even if an instanton can be found which is consistent with some given set of boundary conditions, there is no guarantee that a nearby instanton exists when the boundary conditions are subjected to a small perturbation. In particular, a tunneling channel provided by a given instanton appropriate to a given set of boundary conditions might disappear when these boundary conditions are perturbed.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Riccardo Capovilla and Niall Ó Murchadha for helpful comments on this work. I have especially benefitted from correspondence with the referee who patiently pointed out various flaws in earlier drafts of this paper.

REFERENCES

1. D. Brill in *Gravitation: Problems and Prospects* Naukova Dumka Kiev (1972)

2. D. Brill and S. Deser *Comm Math Phys* **32** (1973) 291

3. A valuable introduction to the subject (containing extensive references) is D. Brill *Linearization Instability* in *Spacetime and Geometry* (ed. by R. Matzner and L. Shepley Univ. of Texas Press, Austin, 1982) For a summary of recent progress, see V. Moncrief in *Directions in Relativity: Papers in honor of D. Brill* ed. by T. Jacobson

and B.L. Hu (Cambridge University Press, 1993)

4. C. Torre *Phys. Rev.* **D46** (1992) 3231

5. For a summary of known results written for mathematicians, see A. Besse *Einstein Manifolds*, (Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1986)

6. E. Witten *Comm Math Phys* **80** (1981) 381

7. The conjecture appears in D. Gross, M. Perry and L. Yaffe *Phys Rev* **D25** (1982) 330

8. N. O'Murchadha and H. Shanaghan *Phys Rev Lett* **70** (1993) 1576

9. J. Wolf *Manifolds of Constant Curvature*, (Publish or Perish, Boston, 1972)

10. C. Misner, K. Thorne and J.A. Wheeler *Gravitation* Freeman, San Francisco (1973)

11. N. Bacon *M.Sc Thesis* (University College Cork, Ireland, 1992); For another (more arduous) proof, see G. Jungman and R. Wald *Phys. Rev.* **D40** (1990) 2619

12. S. Coleman *The Uses of Instantons* in *The Whys of Subnuclear Physics*, ed. by A. Zichichi (Plenum Press, New York, 1979)

13. S. Coleman, V. Glaser and A. Martin *Comm Math Phys* **58** (1978) 211